

FEB 12 1925

WM. H. STANBURY
CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, ~~1924~~ 1925

**HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY,**

Petitioner,

vs.


**FRANK F. DOUDS, HERMAN J.
DOUDS and REBECCA E. McCON-
KEY, Executors of the Last Will and
Testament of ALONZO J. DOUDS,
Deceased,**

Respondents.

No. 265.

**BRIEF OF PETITIONER, HARTFORD LIFE
INSURANCE CO.**

**HARRY B. ARNOLD,
JAMES C. JONES,
FRANK H. SULLIVAN,
JAMES C. JONES, JR.,**
Counsel for Petitioner.



COPY BOUND CLO

INDEX.

	Page
Statement of case.....	1-6
Specification of errors.....	7-8
Points and authorities.....	9
1. Judgment in a suit in which Court has no jurisdiction of subject matter is a denial of due process of law.....	9
2. (a) Subject matter of this suit involved internal affairs of petitioner over which Ohio Court had no jurisdiction.....	9-10
(b) The right to do business in a foreign state does not authorize the Courts of that state to control or regulate the internal affairs of the foreign company.....	11
3. Court has no power to control foreign trustee in the operation of a trust in foreign state	11
4. Courts of Connecticut have already adjudicated respecting subject matter of this suit	12
5. Evidence was insufficient to justify the finding of Ohio Court that the assessments complained of were excessive or excessive to the extent for which judgment was rendered	12
Argument	13
1. A judgment against defendant in a suit in which Court is without jurisdiction of subject matter deprives defendant of its property without due process of law, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.....	13-14

2. The subject matter of this suit involved internal affairs of petitioner over which Ohio Courts had no jurisdiction.....14-39
3. Ohio Court had no power or jurisdiction to control administration of trust, or trust estate, in Connecticut.....39-42
4. Connecticut has ruled contrary to Ohio in the matter here in controversy.....42-46
5. Evidence was insufficient to justify either the finding of the Ohio Court that the assessments complained of were excessive or the judgment for the amount of the alleged excess of such assessments.....46-54

List of Cases Cited in Brief.

- Boyette v. Preston Motors Corporation, 89 So. 746 (Ala.).....11, 28
- Clark v. Mutual Reserve Fund Life Ass'n, 14 App. (D. C.) 154.....10, 23
- Condon v. Mutual Reserve Fund Life Assn., 89 Md. 99, 42 Atl. 944.....10, 15, 32
- Eberhard v. Northwestern Mutual Life Ins. Co., 210 Fed. 520.....10, 24
- Frick v. Hartford Life Insurance Co., 159 N. W. 247 (Ia.).....31
- Guilford v. Western Union Tel. Co., 59 Minn. 332, 61 N. W. 324.....11, 35
- Hartford Life Ins. Co. v. Ibs, 237 U. S. 665—
10, 11, 12, 21, 40, 42
- Hogue v. American Steel Foundries, 247 Pa. 12, 92 Atl. 1073.....11, 29
- Howard v. Mutual Reserve Fund Life Ass'n, 125 N. C. 49, 34 S. E. 199.....10, 11, 23, 34, 35

INDEX—Continued.

iii

Lines v. Lines, 142 Pa. St. 149, 21 Atl. 809....	11, 41
Maguire v. Mortgage Trust Co., 203 Fed. 858...	23
New York Life Ins. Co. v. Dunlevy.....	9
New York Life Ins. Co. v. Head, 234 U. S. 149, 162	11, 36
Old Wayne Mutual Life Ass'n v. McDonough...	9
Olsen v. Danish Brotherhood in America.....	11, 25
Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U. S. 714.....	9, 13
Richards v. Security Mutual Life Ins. Co., 119 N. E. 744 (Mass.).....	10, 24
Riverside Mills Co. v. Menefee, 237 U. S. 189....	9
Royal Fraternal Union v. Lundy, 51 Tex. Civ. App. 637, 113 S. W. 185.....	10, 24, 38
Sauerbrunn v. Hartford Life Ins. Co., 220 N. Y. 363, 115 N. E. 1001.....	10, 24, 33
Scott v. McNeal, 154 U. S. 34, 46.....	9, 13
Selig v. Hamilton, 234 U. S. 652.....	22
State ex rel. Hartford Life Insurance Co. v. Shain, 245 Mo. 78, 149 S. W. 868.....	10, 24
State ex rel. Minnesota Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Denton, 229 Mo. 187, 129 S. W. 709.....	10, 11, 27
Tolbert v. Modern Woodmen of America, 145 Pac. 183 (Wash.)	11, 36
Taylor v. Mutual Reserve Fund Life Ass'n, 97 Va. 60, 33 S. E. 385.....	10, 11, 23
22 Encyc. of Pl. & Pr., p. 21.....	11, 40